



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/625,437	07/23/2003	Maria Iatrou	127005 7917	
7590 09/21/2005		EXAMINER		
Patrick W. Rasche Armstrong Teasdale LLP			KAO, CHIH CHENG G	
Suite 2600			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
One Metropolitan Square			2882	
Saint Louis, MO 63102-2740			DATE MAILED: 09/21/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/625,437	IATROU ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Chih-Cheng Glen Kao	2882	

	Chih-Cheng Glen Kao	2882	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the d	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 13 September 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THI	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of wing replies: (1) an amendment, affortice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in the with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply missing the same control of the same control	Appeal. To avoid aba idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth		
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Interest to the statutory period f	(b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	•	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origon than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropring in ally set in the final Office.	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	•
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further co (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	nsideration and/or search (see NO		ecause
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in being appeal; and/or		ducing or simplifying	the issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a		ected claims.	
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1	` ''		(DTOL 224)
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)		mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).	-	timely filed amendme	nt canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is protected the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:	·	ll be entered and an e	explanation of
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-27</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	<u> </u>	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessarily	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fai	ils to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	red.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered by	it does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowa	nce because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper N	lo(s)	2
13. ☑ Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .		C. M.	<u></u>
	[a		
		SORY PATENT EX	AMINER
	SUPERIVI		

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 7-05)

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Regarding claim 1 at least, the added recitations of quantifying the components of the plaque by determining a weighted sum of densities of pixels of an image of an organ including the plaque, raises new issues that would require further consideration and/or search.

Regarding claim 14, the added recitations of enabling visualization of restenosis within one of a metal stent and a metal valve by repeating the obtaining the components of plaque after scanning a patient having the one of the metal stent and the metal valve, raises new issues that would require further consideration and/or search.

Regarding claim 15 at least, the added limitations of repeating the detection of the components of the plaque after instructing a user to administer a temperature-sensitive contrast agent to accentuate a visualization of the plaque, raises new issues that would require further consideration and/or search.

Regarding claim 26, the added recitations of repeating detection of the components of plaque after instructing a user to administer a contrast agent to accentuate a visualization of the plaque, raises new issues that would require further consideration and/or search.

Regarding claim 27, the added recitations of quantifying the components of plaque by determining a weighted sum of densities, greater than a specific amount, of pixels of an image of an organ including the plaque, raises new issues that would require further consideration and/or search.

Continuation of 13. Other: Regarding Applicants' request for an executed copy of a supplemental information disclosure statement filed on December 3, 2003, the Examiner notes that no such information disclosure statement is found in the application at the Office. The Examiner requests that Applicants provide a copy of said supplement information disclosure statement with evidence showing receipt by the Office of said supplemental information disclosure statement filed on December 3, 2003.

·